IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No.14293 of 1995

Dated: July 19, 2006

Between:

Shari Kumar, S/o. S. Gopaiah, aged about 31 years,
R/o. Budaraopet village, Khanapur Mandal,
Warangal District.

… Petitioner

And

The Secretary, A.P. Social Welfare Residential Educational Institutions Society, Telugu Samkshema Bhavan,
Ground floor, Masab Tank, Hyderabad, and another.

… Respondents

Order:

This writ petition has been filed seeking Mandamus to direct the respondents to interview the petitioner for selection to the post of Postgraduate Teacher (English) in the office of the respondents.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Vijaya Bhaskar Moola, the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents.

3. The first respondent, A.P. Social Welfare Residential Educational Institutions Society, issued notification inviting applications for the post of Postgraduate teachers in English, which was published on 28-02-1995. The petitioner applied for the said post and appeared for written test on 06th and 7th June, 1995. Basing on the said test, the respondents sent him a call letter dated 19-06-1995 to attend interview scheduled from 29-06-1995 to 06-07-1995 at Dr. Ambedkar Bhavan, Hyderabad. The said letter was despatched by the respondents on 21-06-1995. The case of the petitioner is that he received the said letter on 05-07-1995, just one day before the last date of interview. The grievance of the petitioner is that he could not attend the interview on the specified date as he received the call letter from the respondents only on 05-07-1995 at the eleventh hour. It is alleged that there was no fault of his and hence he is entitled to be interviewed by the respondents.

4. Respondents have filed counter affidavit stating that pursuant to the notification issued by them, written test was conducted and all the successful candidates were intimated by way of call letters 10 days prior to the date of the interview and many candidates residing in rural and remote areas have also attended the interview. It is further stated that the cases of the candidates who have reported upto 6.00 p.m. on 06-07-1995, were considered and they were interviewed. It is further stated that the petitioner has approached the respondents belatedly, on 07-07-1995; hence, his case was rejected and the contention of the petitioner that respondents were at fault is untenable.

5. The case of the petitioner is that he received the call letter

sent by the respondents belatedly, i.e. on 05-06-1995. It is to be noticed that even after receiving the letter, he could have rushed to the respondents either on 05-06-1995 or the next day, i.e. 06-06-1995, the last date of interview, and the date on which many candidates residing in remote areas attended the interview upto 6.00 p.m, but he failed to do so. As much as the respondents have despatched the call letter to the petitioner ten days prior to the date of interview and in view of the fact that the petitioner, after receiving the call letter on 05-06-1995 failed to approach the respondents either on 05-06-1995, or on the next day, I do not find any illegality in the action of the respondents in rejecting the case of the petitioner. Hence, no direction as sought for can be given at this point of time, i.e. about 11 years after the selections were made.

6. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

July 19, 2006
MRR